

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 17 and 40 are pending. No claims are allowed. Claims 18 to 39 were withdrawn, and have been cancelled, and will be the subject of a divisional application.

Claims 1 to 17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toneri et al or Takuma et al or Price et al or Yasuda et al. These references alone or even in combination could not possibly produce the claimed invention. The rejections are imputing teachings to the references which they do not contain.

(1) Toneri et al - At best this reference describes the polymerization of glycidyl phenyl ether (GPE; Scheme 1). The polymer has a phenoxy group on each segment of the polymer as shown in Scheme 1. There are no electron withdrawing groups on the phenyl ring. Schemes 2 and 3 show termination reactions for the polymerization. In Scheme 3 the polymer chain is terminated by a F atom. There is no suggestion that the F group is on the phenyl group. The catalysts are not functional with

respect to the aromatic ring and merely facilitate the polymerization.

In Applicants' Claim 1, the aromatic group is substituted with the electron withdrawing group on the aromatic group (see Claim 1). This chemical structure is not even remotely described in Toneri et al. Reconsideration is requested.

(2) Takuma et al contains the same type of disclosure as Toneri et al. The disclosure is directed to catalysts for polymerization of GPE to produce a polymer with no electron withdrawing substitutions on the aromatic ring. This reference is remote from the invention of Claim 1. Reconsideration is requested.

(3) Price et al is even more remote from the invention of Claim 1, since its principal forces is propylene oxide derived polymer with no pendent aromatic rings with electron withdrawing groups. Rates of reaction are discussed with a comparison to GPE which clearly does not suggest the invention of Claim 1. Reconsideration is requested.


Attorney Docket No. MSU 4.1-661
Appl. No. 10/802,635
Amdt. Dated: September 29, 2005
Reply to Office Action of 08/12/2005

(4) Yasuda et al relates to a particular complex alumina ligand catalyst polymerizations, particularly epoxides to form polyethers. The epoxides disclosed have no aromatic groups at all and thus could not possibly suggest the invention of Claim 1. Reconsideration is requested.

It is noted that the Office Action did not deal with the pending claims individually. Clearly the dependent Claims 2 to 17 and 40 are very remote from the claimed invention. Reconsideration is requested.

It is now believed that Claims 1 to 17 and 40 are in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,



Ian C. McLeod
Registration No. 20,931

McLeod & Moyne, P.C.
2190 Commons Parkway
Okemos, Michigan 48864
(517) 347-4100
Fax: (517) 347-4103